

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 10/076,774 | 02/15/2002 | Nicholas Michael Masich | | 3719 |
| 7590 11/30/2004 | | | EXAMINER | |
| Nicholas M. N 316 Bowman D | | | ELVE, MARIA ALEXANDRA | |
| Woodbury, NJ 08096 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1725 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 11/30/2004 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | 10/076,774 | MASICH, NICHOLAS MICHAEL | | | | |
| omee Action Cammary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this account of | M. Alexandra Elve | 1725 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any | | | | | | |
| Status | , | | | | | |
| 1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>16 April 2004</u> . | | | | | | |
| 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final. | | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2 and 3 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign p | riority under 35 H.S.C. & 110(a) | (d) or (f) | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) Interview Summary (F | PTO 413) | | | | |
| Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 4) Interview Summary (F Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Pate 6) Other: |) | | | | |
| U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Office Actio | n Summary Part | of Paper No./Mail Date 20041129 | | | | |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)
- (e) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (f) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (g) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (h) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (j) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Election/Restrictions

During a telephone conversation with Nicholas Masich on September 23, 2003 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, claim 1. (Examiner Anita Alanko) Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 2-3 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

The examiner respectfully reminds the applicant that only claim 1 was selected for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 1 is rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The structure, which goes to make up the device, must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. The claim(s) must be in one sentence form only. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited. It is not clear if applicant is disclosing a method of forming holes or a device that changes the wire surface morphology.

Application/Control Number: 10/076,774

Art Unit: 1725

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DD 127358 (abstract).

DD (127358) discloses a nozzle plate (spinneret) in which laser piercing is used to form the holes. This nozzle is used to form glass fibers (filaments). DD (127358) does not teach the manufacture of synthetic filaments for the application to reduction of tread separation in tires.

It has been held that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and <a href="In

Art Unit: 1725

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 06210858 A (abstract).

JP (06210858 A) discloses an inkjet nozzle in which the holes are formed by laser piercing. The reference does not teach the manufacture of filaments or the relationship to tire treads.

It has been held that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the nozzle to disperse different materials because the type of materials chosen are a choice in design and substitutions of known equivalent structures may be made. In re Kuhle, 188 USPQ (CCPA 1975) and In re Ruff, 118 USPQ 343 (CCPA 1958).

Application/Control Number: 10/076,774

Art Unit: 1725

Response to Amendments

Applicant should submit an argument under the heading "Remarks" pointing out disagreements with the examiner's contentions. Applicant must also discuss the references applied against the claims, explaining how the claims avoid the references or distinguish from them.

Applicant must clarify whether the invention (of claim 1) is a method, an apparatus or a product. In other words, is applicant's invention directed to a method of forming laser pierced holes in the spinneret or a spinneret device? Clarification is required.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See US PTO 892.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Application/Control Number: 10/076,774

Art Unit: 1725

Page 7

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Alexandra Elve whose telephone number is 571-272-1173. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-3:00 Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on 571-272-1171.

November 29, 2004.

H. ALEXANDRA ELVE